

REMARKS

This is in response to the Official Action mailed March 31, 2003. A Petition for Three Month Extension of Time (with fee) is filed concurrently. Accordingly, this Response is timely.

Claims 14-22 remain pending.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the thorough search and analysis of the prior art as well as the careful analysis of the claims and the indication of allowable subject matter.

1. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claims 14-16 based on Novis et al (U.S. Patent 5,993,950). Independent Claim 14 (the only pending independent claim) refers to a glazing comprising three components: a glass substrate, an aluminium oxynitride layer and an oxide layer deposited onto the aluminium oxynitride layer. The Novis et al patent is directed to a glazing which comprises four components, namely, a glass substrate, a first dielectric layer which may be an aluminium oxynitride layer, a metal layer deposited on the dielectric layer, and a second dielectric layer deposited on the metal layer. Since the Novis et al patent does not include the oxide layer deposited onto the aluminium oxynitride layer, (Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's statement that the Novis reference discloses a metal oxide layer deposited onto the aluminium oxynitride layer) there can be no anticipation of independent Claim 14 nor the claims depending therefrom. Applicant respectfully takes no position on the remaining portion of the Office Action relating to this rejection (e.g., page 2, last three paragraphs).

2. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claims 14-16 and 19-22 based on the Otani et al patent. (U.S. Patent 6,498,380). The "undercoating" in the Otani et al patent (i.e., the layer beneath a tin oxide layer) is preferably a two-layer film, although an undercoating of a single layer film is described in Example 4. There is no mention of "aluminium oxynitride" in this reference, and to this extent Applicant respectfully disagrees with the first sentence, second paragraph, page 3 of the Office Action. Since the reference does not mention "aluminium

oxynitride", there can be no anticipation of independent Claim 14 nor the claims depending therefrom. Applicant respectfully takes no position on the remaining portion of the Office Action relating to this rejection (e.g., page 3, second and third paragraphs).

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a conference will expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is requested and encouraged to contact Applicant's Attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

PIPER RUDNICK LLP



Jerold I. Schneider
Registration No. 24,765
Attorney of Record

1200 Nineteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-2412
Telephone No. (202) 861-3900
Facsimile No. (202) 223-2085